UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,335	11/26/2003	Martin Soukup	57983.000166	8387
Thomas E. And	7590 03/25/200 erson	EXAMINER		
Hunton & Williams LLP 1900 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006-1109			ZHU, BO HUI ALVIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/721,335	SOUKUP, MARTIN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BO HUI A. ZHU	2619	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the 101 rejection of claim 11, the Applicant alleges claim 11 recites a tangible embodiment because claim 11 does not recite the processor readable medium that carriers the instructions can be a form of signal. However, as best understood based on the disclosure regarding the medium that could store instructions found on page 19 of the specification as the specification never clearly discloses what a processor readable medium would be, the processor readable medium can be either a processor readable carriers (e.g. a magnetic disk) or signals via which instructions are transmitted to processors. Therefore, because the specification discloses that the processor readable medium can be a form of signal, claimed subject matter "processor readable medium is non-statutory under 101.

Further more, the Applicant argues that Peng does not disclose determining whether the at least part of the source address matches at least one source address recorded within a predetermined time period prior to arrival of the packet. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Peng discloses matching the IP source address of the incoming packets to the source addresses recorded in a hash table for a time interval as found on page 4, section A of Peng.

Further more, the Applicant argues that Peng does nto disclose routing the packet if the at least part of the source address matches at least one source address recorded within the predetermined time period prior to the arrival of the packet. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Peng as found on page 4 of section A discloses if an address of a packet matches one recorded in the hash table, the arrival time of the packet is recorded in the hash table (the packet is routed). The claim merely recites routing a packet but has no limitation on where to route the packet. Therefore, the Examiner believes that the cited reference can properly and reasonably read on the claimed limitation.